UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.              | FILING DATE                            | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/790,941                   | 03/01/2004                             | Joseph Miller        | S63.2-10812-US01    | 2180             |
| <sup>490</sup><br>VIDAS ARRE | 7590 08/24/2007<br>ETT & STEINKRAUS, 1 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| SUITE 400, 66                | SUITE 400, 6640 SHADY OAK ROAD         |                      | COZART, JERMIE E    |                  |
| EDEN PRAIRIE, MN 55344       |  |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                              |  |                      | 3726                |                  |
|                              |  |                      |                     |                  |
|                              |  |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                              |  |                      | 08/24/2007          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|  | Application No.                      | Applicant(s)                         |  |  |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 10/790,941                           | MILLER ET AL.                        |  |  |  |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief   | » Examiner                           | Art Unit                             |  |  |  |
|  | Jermie Cozart                        | 3726                                 |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c    | orrespondence address                |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 17 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A   | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR          | ALLOWANCE.                           |  |  |  |
| ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:   |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is late  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire  | g date of the final rejection.       |                                      |  |  |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WIT TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).   |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);   |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or   |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).   | llowable if submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendment canceling the |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).   |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).   |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.  |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).   | X . (. n -                           |                                      |  |  |  |
| 13. ☑ Other: Note the attached PTO-892 form.   |                                      |                                      |  |  |  |
|  |                                      | JERMIE E. COZART PRIMARY EXAMINER    |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants admit on page 7 of the request for reconsideration that claim 1 does not require the cylindrical member as part of the claimed invention. And therefore, it is the Examiner's position that since that Applicants do not include the cylindrical member as part of the claimed invention then the Examiner is not obligated to interpret the "longitudinal axis" with respect to the cylindrical members only with respect to the longitudinal axis of the first and second plates. The longitudinal axis with respect to the first and second cylindrical members is merely a functional recitation of the operation of the claimed invention. In addition, it appears although not shown, that one of ordinary of skill in the art would be able to insert the cylindrical member in the longitudinal direction. Regarding the orientation of the nests, the nests of Ching are able to accommodate portions of the first and second cylindrical members as evidenced by Figure 6. Applicant argues with respect to claims 6, 12, and 23, that the rejection does not provide any prior art references that would motivate a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ching. In response, the Examiner maintains that those limitations are design choices because Applicants do not dispute that the limitations are design choices, and Applicants fail to disclose that the aformentioned limitations provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. Therefore, the Examiner is not required to provide a reference to show the claimed subject matter. In addition, the limitations of claims 6 and 12 are conventional and well-known, and with respect to the limitation of claim 23, changing the sizes of something in this case a nest, is known.